

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings include changes to Figure 26. The replacement sheet including Figure 26 replaces the original sheet including Figure 26. In Figure 26, reference characters 2650 and 2660 have been added, and the clarity of the text has been improved. Figure 26 has also been rotated.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed June 22, 2007. Claims 1-50 are rejected. Claims 1, 9-11, 13-35, 44, and 46-50 have been amended. Claims 1-50 remain pending in the application.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to for a lack of legibility in Fig. 26. Applicant has amended Figure 26 to clarify various text-based elements. Applicant has also amended Figure 26 to add reference characters 2650 (referring to the “dialog box”) and 2660 (referring to the “results screen”). No new matter is believed to have been added. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The specification is objected to for various informalities. Applicant has amended the specification to correct the various typographical errors noted by the Examiner. Applicant has also amended the specification to include references to reference characters 2650 (referring to the “dialog box”) and 2660 (referring to the “results screen”) added to Figure 26. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the specification is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Claims

Claim 1 is objected to for a lack of antecedent basis for the term “the collaborative application.” Applicant has amended claim 1 to correct the error. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 18-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 18-34 to recite, in pertinent part, a “computer-readable storage medium.” Support for the amendments to claims 18-34 may be found in Applicant’s specification at least on page 63, lines 1-6. Claims 18-34 (as amended) are believed to be limited to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18-34 under § 101 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 9, 11-15, 18-23, 26, 28-32, 35-40, and 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Colyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,621, hereinafter “Colyer”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in light of the following remarks.

Anticipation under § 102(e) requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed below, Colyer fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Colyer does not teach or suggest a method for providing a plurality of collaborative sessions in a networked computing environment, the method comprising “sending collaborative data from a first instance of a collaborative application on a first computer system to a second instance of the collaborative application on a second computer system; sending collaborative data from the second instance of the collaborative application to the first instance of the collaborative application; sending collaborative data from a third instance of the collaborative application on the first computer system to a fourth instance of the collaborative application on the second computer system; and sending collaborative data from the

fourth instance of the collaborative application to the third instance of the collaborative application” as recited in claim 1.

Colyer discloses a personal conferencing method and system for a client/server environment. A server stores conference model data, such as a shared chalkboard, and each client has a copy of the conference model data. When one client edits the model, an instruction for operating on the model is sent from that client to the server and then from the server to the other clients. *See* Colyer, abstract. In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Colyer discloses that “both computers could have two or more instances of the application and send data between the specific instances of the application” (e.g., in Fig. 1 and col. 1, lines 30-40, indicated as prior art for Colyer’s invention). Applicant can find no such teaching or suggestion in Colyer. In col. 1, lines 30-40, Colyer states:

In this environment, for example (see FIG. 1) a conference management/call manager program (18A, 18B) runs in each computer (10A, 10B) drawing upon the services of one or more network adaptors (12A, 12B) to communicate over a network (14). A number of specially written personal conferencing applications (16A, 16B, 16C) connect to the conference management. If a conference includes a shared chalkboard, for example, then on each participating node chalkboard personal conferencing applications (16A, 16B, 16C) will be running. These applications send packets of data to each other, utilising the services of the conference management program (18A, 18B).

Although Fig. 1 of Colyer shows two applications 16A and 16C on the first computer 10A, there is no teaching or suggestion that the two applications are **two instances of the same application**. To the contrary, by labeling the two applications 16A and 16C as “Application A” (which shares the same label as “Application A” 16B on the second computer 10B) and “Application B,” Colyer seems to teach that the two applications 16A and 16C are **not** two instances of the **same** application. Colyer’s reference to the applications 16A, 16B, and 16C as “[a] **number of** specially written personal conferencing **applications**” further indicates that the two applications 16A and 16C are **different applications with different program code** and not two instances of

the same application. Thus, Colyer discloses that only a **single instance** of any particular conferencing application is present on each client computer. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 18, and 35 are patentably distinct from Colyer.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Colyer does not teach or suggest a method for providing a plurality of collaborative sessions in a networked computing environment, the method comprising “maintaining a first collaborative session, wherein the first collaborative session comprises transmission of a first set of collaborative data between a first instance of a collaborative application on a first computer system and a second instance of the collaborative application on a second computer system; maintaining a second collaborative session, wherein the second collaborative session comprises transmission of a second set of collaborative data between a third instance of the collaborative application on the first computer system and a fourth instance of the collaborative application on a third computer system; wherein transmission of at least a portion of the second set of collaborative data occurs prior to transmission of all of the first set of collaborative data” as recited in claim 9 (as amended). As discussed above, Colyer does not teach or suggest two instances of a collaborative application (e.g., the first instance and the third instance recited in claim 1) on the same computer system. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 9, 26, and 43 are patentably distinct from Colyer.

Applicant asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of claims 2-6, 11-15, 19-23, 28-32, 36-40, and 44-48 is not necessary at this time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 24, 25, 33, 34, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colyer in view of Butler (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,493). Claims 10 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colyer in view of Harple et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,091, hereinafter “Harple”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Applicant asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of claims 7, 8, 10, 16, 17, 24, 25, 27, 33, 34, 41, and 42 is not necessary at this time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5602-11700/JCH.

Also filed herewith are the following items:

- ☐ Request for Continued Examination
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer
- ☐ Power of Attorney By Assignee and Revocation of Previous Powers
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☒ Replacement sheet for Figure 26

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey C. Hood/

Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 2007-10-22 JCH/RPH